

**ATTACHMENT 1:**

Density Bonus Hearing Highlights, June 22, 2005

# DENSITY BONUS HEARING HIGHLIGHTS

June 22, 2005

## RPC COMMENTS

- Revise ordinance:
  - Consider 50% DB by right
  - Consider a way to integrate CDC's Infill Sites program into ordinance
  - Consider adding certainty to the incentives and concessions
  - Reconsider recommendation for opening appeals procedure to the public
- Produce parking studies to show that low income households need less parking.
- Brief Board planning deputies before coming back to the Commission.

## LA COUNTY CDC COMMENTS

*Blair Babcock, Assistant Director*

*Bill Huang, Manager of Housing Development and Preservation*

- Apply density bonus and incentives and concessions to CDC's Infill Sites program; in other words, a density bonus ordinance that applies to developments less than 5 units to address infill sites. Sites, which could be developed together as scattered sites or individually, and are less than five units, could benefit from variation in set-backs, common wall developments, flag lots option of sites that are beyond the standard 5000 sq ft, etc.
- A strong consideration that we allow 50% density bonus by-right, as the Code currently offers up to a 50% density bonus with a CUP.
- An ordinance that is predictable, doesn't delay, and has guaranteed, meaningful minimum incentives. Minimum incentives very clearly spelled out, ie., reduction in parking. There are plenty of studies that can back up parking reductions for affordable housing.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY: IN SUPPORT

### *1. Henry Porter, Southwest Community Association*

- Ensure equity in development and the preservation of quality of life by spreading out development in such a way that no burden to existing infrastructure.
- Consider incentives that are tailored to existing situations and considerations.

### *2. Beth Steckler, Livable Places*

- Include a list of by-right concessions, but leave the door open for other incentives and concessions, too—this should not be an exclusive list.
- Consider two different sets of concessions for market-rate with set-asides vs. 100% affordable—especially parking concessions.
- Craft ordinance in such a way that the density is located near transportation resources.
- Height: Add enough height to give another floor, 11 ft or 12 ft addition. Height is necessary for mixed income or affordable.

-Parking—100% affordable more parking reduction. Parking reduction when the project is within ½ or ¼ mile of frequently running transit (should be defined). Consider rapid buses, in addition to rail.

-FAR: Deal with on a percentage basis.

3. *Paul Zimmerman, West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation:*

-Increase density for affordable housing to levels that are comparable to other cities.

-Create certainty through by-right provisions by setting minimum standards, such as parking.

4. *Channa Grace, O.N.E. Company (Opportunities for Neighborhood Empowerment)*

-There needs to be a minimum standards and certainty.

-Have strict conditions to prevent developers from taking advantage of the land donation option.

-Consider density bonuses for very very low income households ( $\leq 30\%$  AMI).

-Require affordable units to be spread out over unit types.

-Parking reduction 50%. 0-1 bed: 1 should be revised. Also, recommend changing '2-3bed: 2' to '2-3 bed: 1.'

5. *Lisa Payne, Southern California Association for Non-Profit Housing*

-A menu of at least minimum concessions would help with certainty.

-Parking recommendations for affordable units. 1 parking space no matter how many bedrooms are in the units. One car per family.

-Remove right of appeal to surrounding neighbors.

6. *Jay Ross, AMCAL*

-Reduced parking. Change '4 bedroom: 2.5' to '4 bedroom: 2.'

By-right 25% parking reduction. Look at numerous parking studies that show that low income residents own fewer cars. Subterranean parking costs \$30,000/space.

-Allow higher density for affordable; economies of scale.

7. *Dora Leong Gallo, A Community of Friends*

-Menu of choices. More certainty.

-Allow up to 50% density bonuses.

-Planning director should not have discretion to terminate covenant and agreements.

-Add clarity for the affordable housing agreement annual reports, including who will be receiving and evaluating the reports.

8. *Ken Bank, Riverbank Development*

-Remove right of neighbors to appeal, which defeats the by-right provision.

-More defined concessions, especially parking.

-Propose that Commission take a look at data that supports that people low income AMI and seniors do not typically have the same number of cars.

9. *Alejandro Martinez, East Los Angeles Community Corporation*

-Certainty and parking reductions.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY: CONCERNED**

*Leon Koziwicz, homeowner*

-Would not like to seem like he is anti-affordable housing, but is concerned about how the granting of density bonuses and incentives and concessions would affect neighborhoods.